

is one that is hard to assess. But here is the State of Vermont basically saying they were lacking creativity in their schools and people didn't bother to try to ask for the waiver. They went ahead and did what Washington said, in spite of the fact that it may not have been best for students, because they had been intimidated. The process was too complex. The desire to get a waiver may never have been really strong enough to get them past the Federal bureaucracy. But the schools are now doing things, trying things, delivering help to students, meeting needs at the site of learning, rather than meeting the appetite of the bureaucracy.

Other Ed-Flex States have used the waiver authority to include all school improvement resources in a single 34-page plan rather than 8 separate plans totaling 200 pages. Can you imagine that? If you can move the paperwork down in the direction of sort of manual operations from 200 pages to 34 pages, you will cut out that kind of paperwork and you are cutting out a wasted resource, and when you stop wasting, you can start delivering.

I am sure this next item is of special interest to the occupant of the Chair, who served as the chief executive of Ohio. Reports indicate that Ohio used its Ed-Flex authority to significantly reduce paperwork in the schools. The education agency of the State also reduced its paperwork. This is great news to hear. Ohio is the State that reported at one time that 52 percent of all the paperwork—I think that is right; the Chair might correct me—required of their school districts was related to participation in Federal programs while the Federal dollars were about 5 percent of the State's total education budget. That means we are costing people a lot in terms of paperwork to get a very small amount of the resource. It is time we freed the system from the burden of paperwork so it can get moving forward to the task of helping students.

States are finding that flexibility and regulatory relief they have gotten under the Ed-Flex program has caused increased student performance. Texas has found that its schools with Ed-Flex waivers made gains that match—and in many instances exceed—those as a whole in the State. And frequently those schools with the waivers were ones that were especially challenged.

Because of the success of the Ed-Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Program, we need to expand this concept to every State in America. In my home State of Missouri, we don't currently have broad authority, the kind of authority we need to waive the Federal regulations that keep our schools from improving education programs. In the past few years, my State, as well as local districts in Missouri, have had to come to Washington on a number of occasions and ask for waivers of certain Federal education statutes so they could administer their programs in such a way that they can better serve

their students. It doesn't make any sense for a State or a school district to keep coming to Washington time after time to beg for permission to help their students. It seems like we could agree that we would allow States to help their students.

That is why I support the Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999, because it gives the States the authority on their own to grant to schools waivers of Federal statutes and regulations for many Federal education programs. States will also be expected to grant waivers of their own regulations which schools believe are barriers to improving education programs. This is a design—a conspicuous and conscious design—to deliver resources to classrooms where students learn and improve their performance.

Around the Nation, Governors of both political parties have called for quick passage of this legislation as it will allow educators to design and to deliver federally funded education dollars in ways that meet the needs of students. As a former Governor, I know how important it is for a State and its local school districts to have decision-making authority over educational matters. The closer the decision-making is to the local level, I feel, the better.

States and local schools are in a better position to know what programs work in their community and elicit the necessary enthusiasm and response from their families which are being served.

I also know that States want to show that their education reforms will actually improve quality of education. When I was Governor of Missouri, I also served as chairman of the Education Commission of the States—all 50 States, legislators, governors, school board officials—the Education Commission of the States. During that time I emphasized a point. And it was this: We must insist that our reform programs create a current of educational improvement. We must show that reforms actually help our children learn more.

Mr. President, I believe that Ed-Flex boosts educational achievement by allowing States to direct resources where they will get to the classroom and help students learn.

So today I want to voice my strong support for the Educational Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999. Under this legislation, Missouri schools and schools across America no longer have to come to Washington to seek education waivers one at a time. But they will have more flexibility to administer federally funded education programs in ways that boost student achievement, and ultimately have as a result more capable students.

States and local schools want more flexibility because they have the best ideas of what will work in their communities. And they want the ability to take that good news to the students of their schools. Important education

groups in my State such as the Missouri State Teachers Association and the Missouri School Board Association have said that flexibility and local control are important goals in Federal education policy.

The Ed-Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999 helps to accomplish these goals. This bill, Ed-Flex, will ultimately help to improve educational opportunities for the children in my State and all over the country by reducing the Federal redtape involved currently with trying to comply with Federal rules and regulations related to educational programs.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled to occur at 2:15 today now occur at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBB. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. ROBB and Mr. WARNER pertaining to the introduction of S. 533 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. WARNER and Mr. ROBB pertaining to the introduction of S. 535 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

(The remarks of Mr. WARNER pertaining to the introduction of S. 536 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair, the indulgence of my colleague, and I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAHAM pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 57 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

Mr. ROBB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as an original cosponsor to the resolution just introduced by the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. I wish to express my thanks and admiration to my colleague from Virginia.

EDUCATIONAL FLEXIBILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Vote on Amendment No. 36

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the vote will now occur on the Jeffords amendment No. 36. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 31 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Abraham	Feingold	Mack
Akaka	Feinstein	McCain
Allard	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Mikulski
Baucus	Gorton	Moynihan
Bayh	Graham	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Murray
Biden	Grams	Nickles
Bingaman	Grassley	Reed
Bond	Gregg	Reid
Boxer	Hagel	Robb
Breaux	Harkin	Roberts
Brownback	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bryan	Helms	Roth
Bunning	Hollings	Santorum
Burns	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchison	Schumer
Campbell	Inhofe	Sessions
Chafee	Inouye	Shelby
Cleland	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kennedy	Snowe
Conrad	Kerrey	Specter
Coverdell	Kerry	Stevens
Craig	Kohl	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
Daschle	Landrieu	Thurmond
DeWine	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dodd	Leahy	Voinovich
Domenici	Levin	Warner
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wellstone
Durbin	Lincoln	Wyden
Edwards	Lott	
Enzi	Lugar	

The amendment (No. 36) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 TO AMENDMENT NO. 35

(Purpose: To authorize additional appropriations to carry out part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), for Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. GREGG, and Ms. COLLINS, proposes an amendment numbered 37 to amendment No. 35.

In Lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. . AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

In addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.), there are authorized to be appropriated \$150,000,000 to carry out such part.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in view of the status of the amendments at this point, in order for the Members working on this legislation to have a chance to discuss how we can proceed, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. BROWNBACK pertaining to the introduction of S. 539 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, just to let the distinguished chairman and manager know, it is my understanding that the sponsor of the pending amendment does not wish at this time for it to be set aside. In lieu of remaining in a quorum call, Senator SMITH and I have decided not to, in fact, ask for a vote on our amendment, but we would like to proceed to at least talk about it for a period of time, and then obviously we will not introduce it, and we will not, therefore, have to withdraw it.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I have no problem as long as it is for debate only and it won't be offered. I have a request to limit Senators to 5 o'clock; apparently, there is something else that needs to be done at 5 o'clock.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am sure Senator SMITH and I will be able to finish by that time—

Mr. JEFFORDS. Fine, I have no objection.

Mr. KERRY. Depending on how things proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am not sure it is subject to an objection anyway, since I have the floor. I believe I am entitled to speak.

But that said, it may be that, depending on how things go with this bill overall, we may decide at an appropriate time that it is worth submitting the amendment, but I think we have to see what the flow is going to be with respect to this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, was the unanimous consent agreed to, to end the quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was, and it would end this discussion and colloquy at 5 o'clock.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I yield such time as needed to my colleague, Senator SMITH of Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I thank Senator JEFFORDS for giving us this time, and my colleague, Senator KERRY, for his leadership on this issue. I also appreciate Senator KERRY's willingness to set aside some of the partisanship that divides us on this issue. There are too many good ideas that Republicans and Democrats share in common for us not to make significant progress on the issue that is on the minds of most parents, perhaps, more than any other—the education of their children.

While Senator KERRY and I will not be introducing our amendment today to this legislation, I think it is important that we take this opportunity to raise the issue of principal training and development.

After speaking with educators, parents, principals, and teachers in both Oregon and in Massachusetts, it became clear to Senator KERRY and I that our principals are too often not prepared to address the needs of our children. As Senator KERRY has said many times, we can't expect our schools to be well managed without good managers. It is time to provide our States and school districts with the resources to train our principals as managers.

Our proposal would provide States the needed resources for the development and training of excellent principals, and the retraining of current principals to improve the way they manage our schools. This competitive principals' challenges grant will allow States to develop programs that focus on providing principals with effective instructional skills and increased understanding of the effective use of educational technology and the ability to implement State content performance standards.

Throughout the debate on the Ed-Flex bill, we have heard a lot about the need for greater accountability. Our proposal does not expect the States to be accountable. Our proposal requires accountability. State educational agencies must specify how the Federal funds will be used for principal training programs, how the use of these funds will lead to improved student achievement and provide, through annual evaluation, evidence of such improvement having occurred.

Importantly, this proposal does not dictate to the States how to implement these programs. Rather, it gives States the opportunity, the resources, and the support to create programs that meet the needs of every school district, rural and urban.

Mr. President, as we continue to debate education reform in the Senate, I believe that we must include a component that reforms the way in which our